

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 15-17, 20-25, 27, 29-32, 38-41 and 44-47 have been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants would initially like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a telephonic interview on 06/29/2004. While no agreement was reached, Applicants explained how the teachings of the cited Rubin reference had the same deficiencies as mentioned in the Description of Related Art section of the present application, and specifically that Rubin's objects required recompilation when actions associated with an object are modified as the actions are hard-coded within the object.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rubin et al. (US 5,862,379) in view of Zellweger (US 6,243,700). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants have amended such claim to further clarify differences between the claimed invention and the teachings of the cited references. In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to expressly recite a separate data structure (i.e. not a part of the object) which is queried for a runtime list of actions that are known to the selected object. By maintaining a list of actions known to an object in a separate data structure, it is possible to modify or customize the actions associated with an object without requiring a recompilation of the object. In contrast, the cited Rubin reference teaches that the methods used to carry out selected functions on an object are methods within the object itself (Rubin Col. 10, lines 34-36), thus requiring that the object must be recompiled when the available selections are subsequently modified (Rubin Col. 10, line 60 – Col. 11, line 14). In addition, because of this object model described by Rubin, where the allowable methods are hard-coded within the object itself, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the teachings contained therein in accordance with the claimed invention. The fact that a prior art device could be modified so as to produce the claimed device is not a basis for an obviousness rejection unless the prior art suggested the desirability of such a modification. *In re Gordon*, 733

F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984), and there is no suggestion of any such desire in the cited references. Therefore, this amendment to Claim 1 is shown to have overcome the rejection of such claim under 35 USC 103.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of dependent Claims 2-6 for similar reasons to those given above regarding independent Claim 1.

Further with respect to Claim 2, Applicants have amended such claim to clarify the two lists that are combined. In particular, the runtime list is a list of actions known to the selected object, and the static list is a list of methods/actions for the object type of the selected object. The Zellweger passage cited by the Examiner in rejecting Claim 2 does not teach or suggest these two types of lists, or the combining of such lists. In the Examiner interview previously mentioned, the Examiner stated that Zellweger's list menu (Col. 4, lines 15-16) was being interpreted to be one list, and Zellweger's HTML list menu (Col. 4, lines 17-18) was being interpreted to be the other list. Applicants initially show that these lists are not combined, but rather one list is a list of links used to navigate to another web page list. Further, none of these lists pertain to an object type for a selected object, and in particular none of these lists list methods/actions for the object type of the selected object, as claimed. Therefore, amended Claim 2 is shown not to be obvious in view of the cited references.

The features of Claim 2 advantageously provide an ability to include both hard-coded and dynamically determined actions in a single list, as described in Applicants' Specification at page 12, lines 3-8.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claims 5 and 6 for further reasons given above regarding Claim 2 (of which Claims 5 and 6 depend upon).

With respect to amended Claim 7, Applicants show that none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed combination of steps of (i) dynamically associating actions with the object based on an object type of the object by querying a separate data structure for a list of actions known to the object type, and (ii) presenting the dynamically associated actions in the graphical user interface, wherein the presented actions are available for immediate execution with respect to the object without recompiling the object. For similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, the cited Rubin reference teaches that the methods used to carry out selected

functions on an object are methods within the object itself, thus requiring that the object must be recompiled when the available selections are subsequently modified. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 7 has overcome the rejection of such claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 8-16 for reasons given above regarding Claim 7 (of which Claims 8-16 depend upon).

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 8 by showing that such claim has been amended to recite inclusion of superclass actions in the list, as described in Applicants' Specification at page 16, lines 4-15 and FIG. 7, elements 712, 714 and 716. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a superclass, or inclusion of superclass actions as part of the presented actions. Thus, Claim 8 is further shown to not be obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 10 by showing such claim has been amended to expressly recite the claimed feature of "wherein the object type is a Java class and the separate data structure is queried using a string name for the Java class", thereby facilitating building the collection of actions which are subsequently presented in a graphical user interface, as described by Applicants' Specification at page 15, line 16 – page 16, line 3. None of the cited references teach or suggest this claimed feature or its resulting advantages.

With respect to Claim 17, such claim expressly recites that a hard-coded association between the associated actions and the object is *absent* within the object. The cited Rubin reference expressly teaches that the actions are hard-coded within the object, in that the data object of Rubin includes, as a part of the data object, methods that are capable of carrying out the functions that are necessary to implement the selections (Rubin Col. 10, lines 34-36), thus requiring that the object must be recompiled when the available selections are subsequently modified (Rubin Col. 10, line 60 – Col. 11, line 14). In addition, because of this object model described by Rubin, where the allowable methods are hard-coded within the object itself, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the teachings contained therein in accordance with the claimed invention.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 18 and 19 for reasons given above regarding Claim 17 (of which Claims 18 and 19 depend upon).

With respect to Claim 20, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 7.

With respect to Claim 21, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 17.

With respect to Claim 22, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 7.

With respect to Claim 23, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of dependent Claims 24-28 for similar reasons to those given above regarding independent Claim 1.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 24 (and dependent Claims 25 and 26) for similar reasons to those given above regarding the further traversal of Claim 2.

With respect to Claim 29, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 7.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 30-39 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 29 (of which Claims 30-39 depend upon).

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 30 for similar reasons to those given above regarding the further traversal of Claim 8.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 32 for similar reasons to those given above regarding the further traversal of Claim 10.

With respect to Claim 40, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 17.

With respect to Claim 41 (and dependent Claims 42 and 43), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 22.

With respect to Claim 44, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 45, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 7.

With respect to Claim 46, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 17.

With respect to Claim 47, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 22.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 6/30/04

Respectfully submitted,



Duke W. Yee
Reg. No. 34,285
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorneys for Applicants